* DR. V. K. JOHN :—" Sir, this is a Bill which is of very great importance. It affects all landlords and tenants regarding the properties in the hands of tenants just before the date of this Act. In the original Act, there was a promise that it would affect only properties leased out till the date of that Act. No tenant hereafter will get any land. For, people will think that after all there will be breach of faith and Government may bring in another legislation later on. Further, this is not in the interests either of the landlord or the tenant. I particularly want to point this out to the Government. I do not know why it should be rushed through like this. Although there is an Ordinance, that applies to municipalities and there cannot be any objection to that. But so far as the City is concerned, it is a breach of faith and it should not be committed. In 1922 when the original Act was passed it was stated that it would not affect any land leased after the passing of the Act. But now in 1935, we are saying that any lands which were leased after 1922 will be affected. That is a very important thing. This is not in the interests of the tenants themselves. Therefore, we want to move amendments and we want to have a thorough discussion on this.

" Another thing, Sir. It was the practice to print the provisions of the Act when an amendment was proposed to be made. Here nothing is printed. I ask sincerely ' How many members of this House have made a critical study, comparative study of the original Act, and this Bill? '' Not many. I made a study of it. Government have brought in this amendment without mentioning what the provisions of the previous Act are. If the House is to function usefully, it should not be done like this. Some Bill is passed yesterday in the Assembly and is brought in here to-day and goes through this House. No doubt it will go through this House. Still we must have a say in the matter. Therefore, I press that this Bill should be taken up some time later, and thus the privileges of this House should be preserved."

III.—(1) MOTION UNDER RULE 21 (3) OF THE COUNCIL RULES.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM :—" Sir, in view of what the hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition says, I would suggest that this Bill be taken up in the afternoon at 2-30. Because we are going to adjourn this evening, I would very much urge that this be taken up to-day itself. However, it may be put on to the afternoon, I therefore move—

> ' *That under Rule* 21 (3) *of the Council Rules, the order of business of the House be changed and the Madras City Tenants' Protection (Amendment) Bill,* 1955, *be taken up to-day afternoon at* 2-30. ' "

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" The question is—

' That under Rule 21 (3) of the Council Rules, the order of business of the House be changed and the Madras City Tenants' Protection (Amendment) Bill, 1955, be taken up to-day afternoon at 2-30.' "

The motion was carried.